March 4, 1969

Editor, Washington Post
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir,

COPY

Is there no end to your indecent fawning of the murdered Robert Kennedy with responsibility for the defents in the investigation of his brother's murder? You have done it often, with the foul words from other's mouths. Now you utter them in your own name, editorially insisting that those believing the investigation was inadequate must "conclude that many distinguished men - Lyndon B. Johnson, Earl Warren, Richard Russell, J. Edgar Hoover and even Robert Kennedy, had engaged in the foulest kind of plot". You forgot the Department of Justice charwomen!

Then you want to "lay to rest all the tales and theories that surrounded the death (wasn't he murdered?) of President Kennedy and the work of the Warren Commission."

Robert Kennedy had nothing to do with the investigation of his brother's murder. Maybe he should have, but he didn't. One of your editors was invited to attend the autopsy. He declined. Is he, in your twisted logic, not also responsible for the defeciencies of that autopsy?

Or didn't you know about them, depending as you do on your own columns for news? Well, one of the three autopsy doctors, a defense witness, testified that the basis of the Warren Report, the alleged ballistics, was impossible. He swore that he had not made (and no one else had, either), those examinations required in the autopsy of even a Bowery bum. Why? Orders - from a general or an admiral.

The defense witness, FBI Agent Frazier, testified that there never was an effort to discover what happened, that he did only what he was ordered to, and that this kept him from making any effort to find where the shots were or could have been fired from. He testified all he was told to do was see if it was possible for the shots to have come from the sixth-floor window and hit the car -not even that they did. He testified he was not told to try any other point. "Tales"? "Theories?

May we now expect further ringing editorials in the Washington Post? There were none with what one might ordinarily consider a proper subject for comment, that there was nothing that could, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered an autopsy, nothing that could be presented in the most blighted court. There were none when it became official, tested in court, that there was no investtigation of the President's murder, merely a whitewash. Therefore, the next logical step if for you to proclaim this, indeed, is the way to investigate the murder of a President.

The FBI agent testified these were his orders. I dare you ask Earl Warren or Richard Russell if he gave such instructions - or knew they were given.

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg